REMARKS

In the Office Action[1], the Examiner rejected claims 1-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,853,713 to Fobert et al. ("*Fobert*"). By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1-4, 6-25, 29, and 33-52, and cancel claim 5 without prejudice or disclaimer.

I. The Rejection of Claims 1-52 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

A. Claims 1-8

Claim 1 recites, for example, a computer-implemented method comprising "determining whether the incoming call meets the criteria defined by the filter settings to be added to the address book ... wherein the filter settings are received from the user in advance of the incoming call" (emphasis added). *Fobert* fails to teach, or even suggest, at least the claimed notification.

Fobert discloses a client terminal controller adapted to retrieve information about an incoming caller and convey the information to a client terminal user on a graphical display (*Fobert*, abstract). *Fobert's* client terminal controller may retrieve information from an address book database, and can also automatically update the address book database (*Fobert*, col. 2, lines 29-52). For example, for first time callers with no existing information in the address book database, the user can automatically update the address book after the incoming call is detected (*Fobert*, col. 6, lines 21-31).

---

[1] The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

However, *Fobert's* address book is updated according to the user <u>after</u> the incoming call is detected, whereas the claimed filter settings are received "in advance of the incoming call." Further, the claimed filter settings define criteria for "determining whether to add incoming calls" to the address book, whereas *Fobert's* users simply determine whether to add individual callers to the address book <u>as calls are received</u>. Therefore, *Fobert* fails to teach or suggest the claimed "determining whether the incoming call meets the criteria defined by the filter settings to be added to the address book ... wherein <u>the filter settings are received from the user in advance of the incoming call</u>," as recited by independent claim 1 (emphasis added).

Therefore, *Fobert* cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 1. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1, and are allowable at least due to their dependence from allowable base claims.

B. Claims 9-17 and 25-33

Claim 9 recites, for example, a computer-implemented method comprising "providing access to a contact source, the contact source <u>being remote from the user and including a plurality of listings representing communications between the user and other parties</u>, the plurality of listings including at least one listing representing a communication between the user and a second party" (emphasis added). *Fobert* fails to teach, or even suggest, at least the claimed contact source.

Users of *Fobert's* system may interact with a graphical user interface that displays a pop-up window for each incoming call to the user (*Fobert*, FIG. 7 and col. 5, line 56 to col. 6, line 3). *Fobert's* graphical interface can view pop-up windows for a

number of different calls concurrently (*Fobert*, FIG. 7). However, *Fobert* does not

disclose a <u>remote</u> contact source that includes listings for a <u>plurality</u> of calls or other

communications. Therefore, *Fobert* fails to teach or suggest "providing access to a

contact source, the contact source <u>being remote from the user and including a plurality</u>

<u>of listings representing communications between the user and other parties</u>, the plurality

of listings including at least one listing representing a communication between the user

and a second party," as recited by independent claim 9.

Therefore, *Fobert* cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 9. Independent

claims 25, 29, and 33, although of different scope than claim 9 and from each other,

recite subject matter similar to that discussed above with respect to claim 9, and

therefore are not taught or suggested by *Fobert*. Claims 10-17 depend from claim 9,

claims 26-28 depend from claim 25, and claims 30-32 depend from claim 29, and are

allowable at least due to their dependence from allowable base claims.

C. Claims 18-24

Claim 18 recites, for example, a computer-implemented method comprising

"accessing a communications log associated with the user<u>, the communications log</u>

<u>reflecting prior communications between the user and other parties including the contact</u>

<u>... [and]</u> obtaining contact-related information associated with the contact using

information included in the communications log." *Fobert* fails to teach, or even suggest,

at least the claimed communications log.

Fobert discloses that the address book database can be updated when an

incoming call is detected by the client terminal controller (*Fobert*, col. 7, lines 7-10). If

the caller's phone number is not found in the address book database, the client terminal controller queries a server, displays the caller's information on a display, and gives the user the opportunity to update the address book database (*Fobert*, col. 7, lines 9-23).

The Office Action alleges that these portions of *Fobert* disclose updating the caller's information (Office Action at p. 5). Further, the Office Action appears to draw the inference that, because the caller's information is being updated, the user has necessarily communicated with the calling party prior to the update (Office Action at p. 5). This is incorrect. The cited portions of *Fobert* disclose updating the address book database by adding a new caller to the address book database, not by updating an existing entry in the address book database. Therefore, *Fobert's* address book database does not reflect "prior communications" with a contact being added to the address book. For these reasons, *Fobert* does not teach or suggest "accessing a communications log associated with the user, the communications log reflecting prior communications between the user and other parties including the contact ... [and] obtaining contact-related information associated with the contact using information included in the communications log" as recited by independent claim 18 (emphasis added).

Therefore, *Fobert* cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 18. Claims 19-24 depend from claim 18, and are allowable at least due to their dependence from the allowable base claim.

D. Claims 34-52

Independent claim 34 recites, for example, a computer-implemented method comprising "updating the address book to reflect the change in the contact-related information, wherein the address book is updated periodically independently of when communications are received from the party" (emphasis added). *Fobert* fails to teach, or even suggest, at least this subject matter of claim 34.

As discussed, *Fobert's* updates to the address book database are triggered by incoming calls, and users are given the opportunity to update the address book database if the caller's phone number is not found in the address book database (*Fobert*, col. 7, lines 7-23). Because *Fobert's* address book database updates are performed when incoming calls are received, *Fobert's* updates are not "independent" of when communications are received, and are not performed "periodically." Therefore, *Fobert* fails to teach or suggest "updating the address book to reflect the change in the contact-related information, wherein the address book is updated periodically independently of when communications are received from the party" as recited by independent claim 34.

Thus, *Fobert* cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 34. Claims 35-52 depend from claim 34, are allowable at least due to their dependence from the allowable base claim.

II Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully

request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance

of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge

any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 2, 2009   By: _Philip J. Hoffmann_
                                   Philip J. Hoffmann
                                   Reg. No. 46,340